REMARKS

The present Office Action imposes a restriction requirement necessitating the election of one of two allegedly distinct species of the claimed invention for prosecution on the merits and to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Applicant respectfully notes that Examiner's correlation of Embodiments 1 and 2 with Figures 1-12 and 13-17, respectively, is erroneous (there are only 9 figures in the Application). In a telephone conversation with the Examiner on April 19, 2005, Examiner identified Embodiment 1 as being Claims 6-24, and Embodiment 2 as being Claims 35-55. Accordingly, Applicant hereby elects, without traverse, the species of Embodiment 1, namely, Claims 6-24.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that each of the claims now pending in the application is allowable, and that the application as a whole is in proper form and condition for allowance. Examination and allowance is therefore respectfully requested, such that the application may advance to issuance at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that the application can be placed in even better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By:_____
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201-0784
(512) 370-2851